

JUN 29 2007

Application No. 10/655,322

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 11-14, 16, 19 and 21 are pending. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended for clarity as well as to introduce the features of claims 7 and 15 into the respective independent claims.

The Final Office Action included no rejections of claims 7 and 15, and these features have now been incorporated into the corresponding independent claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections based on the following comments.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended to their undersigned representative in a phone interview today. The Examiner acknowledged that the pending claims did not include previous claims 7 and 15. The Examiner indicated that she would review the references to verify the status of the claims upon the filing of this amendment.

Double Patenting Rejection Over U.S. 6,225,007

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-13 and 16-19 under non-statutory obviousness-typically double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,225,007 to Horne et al. (the Horne patent). While Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 15 to respectively incorporate features of claims 7 and 15. Since claims 7 and 15 were not rejected under this rejection, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Double Patenting Rejection Over U.S. 6,387,531

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9-13, 17-19 and 21 under non-statutory obviousness-typically double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-20 of U.S. Patent 6,387,531. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 15 to respectively incorporate features of claims 7 and 15. Since claims 7 and 15 were not rejected under this rejection, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Application No. 10/655,322

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Over U.S. 6,106,798

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11-13, 16, 17 and 19 under the judicial doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent 6,106,798. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 15 to respectively incorporate features of claims 7 and 15. Since claims 7 and 15 were not rejected under this rejection, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Over U.S. 6,506,493

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-14, 17-19 and 21 under the judicial doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent 6,506,493. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 15 to respectively incorporate features of claims 7 and 15. Since claims 7 and 15 were not rejected under this rejection, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Over U.S. 6,726,990

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 10-13 and 18-19 under the judicial doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent 6,726,990. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 15 to respectively incorporate features of claims 7 and 15. Since claims 7 and 15 were not rejected under this rejection, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/655,322

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter S. Dardi, Ph.D.
Registration No. 39,650

Customer No. 62274
Dardi & Associates, PLLC
2000 U.S. Bank Plaza
220 South 6th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: (404) 949-5730